

Appl. No. : 09/815,507
Filed : March 23, 2001

REMARKS

This paper amends the specification and Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 13, 14 and 16. Claims 2-4, 6, 9-12 and 15 are unchanged. New Claims 17-24 are added. Claims 1-24 are pending. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims in light of the present remarks is respectfully requested. The amendments for Claims 5, 8, 13, 14 and 16 are for clarification, are not meant to avoid any prior art and are not narrowing. Applicant has amended the title to be more descriptive as requested by the Examiner. Applicant has amended the preamble of Claim 1 from "from a sender" to be "by a sender" to clarify that the data is sent to the recipient from a database and not from a sender. Applicant has also added the limitation "sending said data stored in said database to said recipient's e-mail address or URL address" to further clarify Claim 1 and explicitly describe the action of sending the data. Applicant has added the limitation "retrieving said data stored in said database to said URL address" to clarify Claim 7 and explicitly describe the action of retrieving the data using the URL address for the recipient.

Discussion of Claim Objections

Claims 5 and 14 were objected to because of informalities. Claims 5 and 14 have been amended to use the term "secured" as suggested by the Examiner.

Discussion of Claim Rejection under 35 USC § 112, 2nd ¶

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended Claim 8 to correct the indefiniteness.

Discussion of Claim Rejection under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1-3, 7-9 and 12 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over King et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,742,022) in view of Jändel (U.S. Patent No. 6,097,793). Claims 4, 5, 13 and 14 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over King et al. in view of Jändel as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Ala-Laurila (U.S. Patent No. 6,246,871) and Enzmann et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,516,203). Claims 6, 15 and 16 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over King et al. in view of Jändel and further in view of Enzmann

Appl. No. : 09/815,507
Filed : March 23, 2001

et al. Claims 10 and 11 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over King et al. in view of Jändel as applied to Claim 9 above, and further in view of Ala-Laurila.

The Examiner has admitted that the King patent does not disclose the element “associating an e-mail address or a URL address with said identifier by the manager” of Claim 1 or “said manager associates an e-mail address or a URL address with the recipient’s mobile phone number” of Claim 7. The Examiner submits that Jändel teaches these limitations at column 1, line 66 to column 2, line 14 and at column 5, lines 9-19. Jändel describes associating a phone number with an e-mail address or URL via a publicly available directory service connected to the Internet. However, in Applicant’s method, the data source for the associating is by no means publicly available for every subscriber. Applicant has amended Claim 1 to recite “wherein the associating comprises selectively accessing said database according to whether the sender is a subscriber to the sending data service” and Claim 7 to recite “said manager creates and associates a URL address with the recipient’s mobile phone number”. Neither King, Jändel, nor their combination discloses the amended limitations of Claim 1 and 7.

Moreover, when combining King and Jändel and a person’s name does not appear in the publicly available directory, one is still faced with the problem of how to obtain the person’s contact information in order to transfer the data. In Applicant’s method, this drawback is overcome by creating a personalized URL when a person’s name is not found in the database. In this way, a user is also not obliged to leave confidential personal data, like a phone number, in a publicly accessible database as in Jändel.

The Examiner has stated that column 7, lines 62-65 of the King patent read on “transferring an identifier to the manager, wherein the sender transfers said identifier comprising **at least a recipient’s mobile phone number**” of Applicant’s Claim 1, and “identifying the recipient by the manager through **the recipient’s mobile phone number**” of Applicant’s Claim 7. Applicant respectfully disagrees as there is no disclosure of a recipient’s mobile phone number at the cited portion of the King patent. The destinations listed for the response to the service request (where the results of the service request are sent), including fax machines and

Appl. No. : 09/815,507
Filed : March 23, 2001

printers, do not identify the recipient since the machines typically have many users. This is unlike a mobile telephone which has a telephone number assigned to a single subscriber.

The Examiner has stated that column 7, lines 52-59 of the King patent read on “wherein the recipient enters into the connection with the manager by sending an identifier to said manager, and wherein said identifier allows said manager to **identify said owner**” of Applicant’s Claim 7. The cited portion of the King patent states that identification information “identifies or describes the select data or information contained in a particular database or network”. Identifying or describing information does not disclose the ability to “identify said owner” of the data. In Applicant’s method, the owner of data submits their data to the database and provides an identifier that correlates to the owner, such that the owner’s data can be retrieved. The King reference does not disclose the ability to “identify said owner”.

Claims 2-6 and 8-16 are dependent either directly or indirectly on one of the above-discussed independent claims. Applicant respectfully submits that pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶4, the dependent claims incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claim to which they refer and include their own patentable features, and are therefore in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of all claim rejections and prompt allowance of the claims.

New Claims

Applicant has added new Claims 17-24. The new claims are based on original Claims 7-12 and 15-16.

Conclusion

In light of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections are specifically requested. In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims of the above-identified application are in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner finds any impediment to allowing all claims that can be resolved by telephone, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned.

Appl. No. : 09/815,507
Filed : March 23, 2001

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: November 24, 2004

By: Raimond J. Salenieks
Raimond J. Salenieks
Registration No. 37,924
Agent of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550

S:\DOCS\RJS\RJS-8170.DOC 112404